



Tier II Consultation Meeting

DRAFT Minutes – May 25, 2021

Please join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/230072333>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: [+1 \(646\) 749-3122](tel:+16467493122)

Access Code: 230-072-333

Committee Members:

John Donovan FHWA
Matt Fuller FHWA
Tony Greep FTA
Michael Leslie EPA
Mark Pitstick RTA
Chris Schmidt IDOT
Rory Davis IEPA
Russell Pietrowiak CMAP

Participants:

William Raffensperger IDOT
Mary Young Civiltech
Felecia Hurley IDOT
John Sherrill IDOT
Scott Marlow IDOT
Jennifer Hyman Civiltech
Leroy Kos CMAP
Elliot Lewis CMAP
Sarah Buchhorn CMAP
Claire Bozic CMAP
Tom Murtha CMAP
Craig Heither CMAP
Martin Menninger CMAP
Mark Janssen LADCO
Matthew Harrell IEPA

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 p.m. All participants introduced themselves.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

None.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – December 17, 2020

On a motion by Mark Pitstick, seconded by Chris Schmidt the minutes of the December 17, 2020 meeting were approved.

4.0 Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity Analysis

CMAP Staff, Russell Pietrowiak provided an overview of the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity amendments and analysis memo, including the addition (for informational purposes) of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG's) that was released for public comment on CMAP's website and that was included in CMAP's weekly email that is distributed externally, stating that no public comments were received and that the MPO Policy Committee would consider approval of the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity amendments at their June meeting.

5.0 MOVES3 Model

CMAP Staff, Russell Pietrowiak stated that the new model will need to be run at the county level and which is a change from the regional level analysis that CMAP currently does. CMAP will be contacting IEPA to get some specific files that IEPA provides CMAP, at the county level. Russell Pietrowiak stated that various MOVES inputs will likely be discussed at a future meeting. Mark Janssen stated that LADCO would like to be included in any data discussions with IEPA. Concerns were expressed that running MOVES for each county will make the modeling take significantly longer.

6.0 2008 OZONE NAAQS Nonattainment Reclassification Status Updates

Michael Leslie provided an update stating that IEPA has put in request for an exceptional event demonstration regarding related to some of the days during the past Ozone season that had exceedances. Depending on which way that request goes will determine the nonattainment status for the region. If, the exceptional event request is approved then IEPA will be submitting a redesignation request for attainment. If it is not approved, then the region could get bumped up to severe nonattainment. January/February time frame to decide and then 12 months to make a new SIP for the severe classification. The region is either going to head toward a redesignation to attainment or to severe depending on what happens regarding the exceptional event demonstration. Rory Davis from IEPA stated that are waiting for the US EPA decision. Russell Pietrowiak asked what either track means for the region's Motor Vehicle Emissions budget. Michael Leslie stated that the region would use the moderate budget submitted for attainment. If the region is headed toward a severe classification, then a new budget would need to be made. Michael Leslie stated that the region should know by July which direction it is headed.

7.0 2015 Ozone NAAQs Development

CMAP Staff, Russell Pietrowiak asked about the status of McHenry County as it pertains to being in the nonattainment area for the region. Michael Leslie stated that it was coming soon, and McHenry would rejoin the nonattainment area. Michael Leslie stated that a bump up to marginal would be occurring soon, with a bump up to serious standard occurring a few years after that. Rory Davis concurred that attaining the 2015 standard does not appear likely in the near term.

8.0 North Lake Shore Drive Air Quality Modeling Presentation

CMAP Staff, Claire Bozic gave a presentation on the GHG modeling efforts for the North Lake Shore Dr project. The methodology being used by CMAP for estimating GHG associated with this project were presented. The difference between using the inventory mode and rate mode for project level analysis were discussed. CMAP uses the rates mode for project level analysis, specifically for large, regionally significant projects. The rates tables that CMAP generated were discussed. One issue is that start rates were created only for passenger cars. It was stated that that is something that may be done using the new MOVES model, when new rates tables will be developed. Mark Jansen stated that starts are not just cars starting but a fraction of all the cars during that time period. CMAP may consider aggerating instead of averaging the starts rates. Claire Bozic stated that care needs to be taken when applying this methodology to small geographies and that corridors are really the smallest level of geography where this method should be used. It was also stated that more research needs to be done to better understand how to calculate the impacts of starts. Russell Pietrowiak stated that if this methodology/approach is acceptable CMAP is likely to use it in the future to analysis other large scale projects and doing other GHG modeling. Chris Schmidt stated that there might be guidance related to this type of analysis coming from the federal level at some point. John Donovan concurred and stated there was a lot of information presented and it would be worth following up on. Michael Leslie stated that he would also be interested in further discussions on how to do this type of analysis. Mark Janssen suggested also looking at the hoteling rate, which may be undercounted. Bill Raffensperger asked if GHG analysis at the project level will be required in a similar manner that a Cosim analysis is. CMAP staff stated that right now it's not required but is being used to show in some cases, the air emissions impact on various populations or the impact of the project. Jennifer Hyman stated that they are using this for the NLSO project to show the public, which is interested in seeing GHG information as it relates to the project. Claire Bozic also stated that this might be a good way to look at large scale transit projects too.

9.0 Carbon Monoxide Hot-Spot Analysis

A discussion regarding the requirement to conduct CO "hot-spot" analysis in the CMAP region took place. The state is in attainment of the Carbon Monoxide NAAQS however, there has been recent discussions between CMAP, IDOT, IEPA, and US EPA over what is and or should be required for specific projects that meet the threshold for analysis and that it wasn't entirely clear to everyone what is required and if any changes should be

made. Michael Leslie stated that US EPA didn't have the requirement since Illinois is in attainment of the standard. John Donovan stated that he would like to follow up with Matt Fuller to see what the requirements are. John Sherill stated that he had seen this same issue in Ohio and that it was possible that an update was needed to reflect the attainment status of the state. John Donovan said that he didn't think this was required as a conformity issue. Rory Davis said that this needed to be analyzed as part of an environmental impact analysis to make sure the project would not cause a violation. Rory Davis also stated that the volume of cars is important and that you still need to demonstrate, through analysis that the project would not cause an exceedance of the standard. Scott Marlow stated that project level screening requirements eliminate the need for further analysis almost all the time. Rory Davis stated that the impact study is the reason that this would need to be done and that Illinois being in attainment of the standard is not a reason not to do this analysis. Bill Raffensperger stated that there is a project in Kane County that prompted this discussion. Rory stated that doing this analysis should not change but the vehicle threshold might need to be revisited. Felice Hurley stated that this helps to understand the issue, and that CO is more of an issue when cars are idling, which projects almost always are reducing or eliminating. Russell Pietrowiak stated that there were 3 issues; one does the attainment status of Illinois impact the need to do this analysis and based on IEPA's comments it does not. Two, does the evaluation criteria need to be revisited, perhaps yes. The third thing is should project's/topics like this come to the consultation committee for discussion. The next step is likely to update data based on the new MOVES model and perhaps update or tweak the Cosim model. Scott Marlow stated that the program would need to be updated is the ADT threshold was changed. Russell Pietrowiak stated that an update to this discussion with perhaps a Tollway presentation on what they have done for their large projects but that there would be no changes to the current process at this time.

10.0 ON TO 2050 Update

Russell Pietrowiak stated that the ON TO 2050 update has begun, and the sponsors of Regionally Significant Projects would soon be conducted to update their projects. It is not anticipated that there will be large scale changes to the current plan. This item will be discussed again at a future Tier II consultation meeting as the process develops.

11.0 Other Business

None

12.0 Public Comment

None

13.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on call.

14.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.